

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-2575

**FY 2003 APPLICATION KIT FOR NEW GRANTS
UNDER
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION
RESEARCH
DISABILITY REHABILITATION RESEARCH PROGRAM (DRRP)**

CFDA NUMBER: 84.133A

Health Services Research; Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds; and Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research



FORM APPROVED
OMB No. 1820-0027, EXP. DATE 2/28/2003
ED FORM 424, 11/30/2004

DATED MATERIAL - OPEN IMMEDIATELY

CLOSING DATE: NOVEMBER 12, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>SECTION</u>
Dear Applicant Letter.....	A
Final Priority Notice.....	B
Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards.....	C
Selection Criteria for the Health Services Research.....	D
Selection Criteria for the Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds.....	E
Selection Criteria for the Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research..	F
Additional Selection Criteria to be used on all the priorities.....	G
Additional Background Information.....	H
Protection of Human Subjects Information	I
Frequently Asked Questions & Points to Remember in Application Preparation	J
Application Transmittal Instructions for Mail or Hand Delivery	K
Instructions for Application	L
Part I: Federal Assistance Face Page (424)	
Part II: Budget Information	
Part III: Application Narrative	
Part IV: Assurances, Certifications, Disclosures	
• Assurances - Non-Construction Programs;	
• Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters, and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements;	
• Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction;	
• Disclosure of Lobbying Activities;	
DUNS Number Instructions.....	M
Application Checklist.....	N

12 September 2002

Dear Applicant:

The Secretary invites applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2003 for the Health Services Research; Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds; and Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) Program (CFDA 84.133A), authorized under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

You must clearly identify the priority on the cover page of the application in block 4, by placing the CFDA number and title. 84.133A-8 is the Health Services Research; 84.133A-11 is the Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds; and 84.133A-14 is the Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

This application kit contains information and the required forms for potential applicants to apply and be considered for a FY 2003 grant award under these competitions including the published Federal Register notice dated September 12, 2002. Potential applicants are advised to read the materials carefully, particularly the information on the types of organizations that are eligible to apply for these grants, how to prepare an application, the dollar amount for any year, the protection of human subjects, and the selection criteria for the appropriate priority (Sections D, E, and F) used by the reviewers to evaluate each application.

These instructions indicate that you can submit your application to the Department by mail (postmarked) or hand-deliver or by carrier service one original and two copies of your application on or before the application deadline date, to the following address: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA Number 84.133A- and title, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3671, Regional Office Building #3, Washington, DC 20202-4725. NIDRR would appreciate your including seven additional copies of your application to facilitate the peer review process (eight copies in all).

Also, we would like to suggest that the original copy of the application be secured with a binder clip in order to facilitate any additional copying that might be required. We are encouraging you to submit your application electronically. The closing date (application deadline) is **NOVEMBER 12, 2002.**

The program narrative must address the selection criteria for the appropriate priority used for this program that are included in this application packet (Sections D, E, and F). To facilitate the peer review process, you should address the criteria in the order presented. Additionally, each proposal **should include a one page abstract**. The abstract is a critical component of the proposal, and it should highlight the purpose, target population to be served during the project period, planned goals and objectives, innovative strategies utilized, project outcomes, and dissemination. Remember to address the additional 10 selection criteria points.

PROGRAM RULES

These grants are subject to the requirements of Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 34 CFR Part 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, and 97, which set forth general rules affecting the submittal, review, grant award, and post-award administration for Department of Education grant programs.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

If you have any questions about the information in this application packet, please contact Donna Nangle at Donna.Nangle@ed.gov or by telephone at (202) 205-5880. Individuals who use a telecommunications device (**TDD**) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (**FIRS**) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., EST, Monday through Friday.

NOTE: Please forward this entire application packet to the individual or office responsible for preparing an application as they will need the entire packet to complete the grant application.

Thank you for your interest in these programs.

Sincerely,

Steven James Tingus, M.S., C.Phil.
Director,
National Institute on Disability
and Rehabilitation Research

SECTION B

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) Program

AGENCY: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of final priorities.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services announces final priorities on Health Services Research; Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds; and Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) Program of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR).

The Assistant Secretary may use these priorities for competitions in fiscal year (FY) 2003 and later years. We take this action to focus research attention on an identified national need. We intend these priorities to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These priorities are effective October 12, 2002.

B-1

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Nangle, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3412, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-2645. Telephone: (202) 205-5880 or via the Internet:

donna.nangle@ed.gov

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the TDD number at (202) 205-4475.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) Program

The purpose of the DRRP Program is to plan and conduct research, demonstration projects, training, and related activities that help to maximize the full inclusion and integration of individuals with disabilities into society and to improve the effectiveness of services authorized under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (the Act).

New Freedom Initiative and The NIDRR Long-Range Plan

This priority reflects issues discussed in the New Freedom Initiative (NFI) and NIDRR's Long-Range Plan (the Plan). The NFI can be accessed on the Internet at:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/freedominitiative/freedominitiative.html>

The Plan can be accessed on the Internet at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/NIDRR/Products>

Supplementary Information: General

We published a notice of proposed priority (NPP) for Health Services Research projects in the Federal Register on May 29, 2002 (67 FR 37655). We also published separate NPPs for Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds in the Federal Register on May 29, 2002 (67 FR 37653) and for Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects in the Federal Register on May 29, 2002 (67 FR 37647). We have combined in this notice of final priorities (NFP) three priorities. This NFP contains several significant changes from the NPPs. Specifically, for the Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds, we have made changes to include a question pertaining to the criminal justice system; an additional requirement that family members, as well as deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers from diverse backgrounds be included in all stages of research;

and that question (2) regarding model psychological testing instruments and mental health outcome measures be split into two separate research questions. For the Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects, we have made three changes. We have added the words "principally", "alternative", and "rehabilitation researchers" and "family members" to the priority.

Analysis of Comments and Changes

In response to our invitation in the NPPs, several parties submitted comments on the proposed priorities (three parties for the Health Services Research, twenty parties for the Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds, and two parties for the Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research under the Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects). We fully discuss these comments as well as changes made in the Analysis of Comments and Changes published as an appendix to this notice.

The backgrounds for the priorities were published in the NPPs.

Generally, we do not address technical and other minor changes and suggested changes the law does not authorize us to

make under the applicable statutory authority.

Note: This notice does not solicit applications. In any year in which we choose to use one or more of these priorities, we invite applications through a notice in the Federal Register. When inviting applications we designate the priority as absolute, competitive preference, or invitational. The effect of each type of priority follows:

Absolute priority: Under an absolute priority, we consider only applications that meet the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(3)).

Competitive preference priority: Under a competitive preference priority, we give competitive preference to an application by either (1) awarding additional points, depending on how well or the extent to which the application meets the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i)); or (2) selecting an application that meets the priority over an application of comparable merit that does not meet the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(ii)).

Invitational priority: Under an invitational priority, we are particularly interested in applications that meet the invitational priority. However, an application that meets the invitational priority does not receive competitive or absolute preference over other applications (34 CFR 75.105(c)(1)).

PRIORITIES

Priority 1--Health Services Research Projects

This priority is intended to improve delivery of health services to individuals with disabilities. An applicant must propose research projects under one of the following specific topic areas:

(1) Availability and Access to Community-Based Health Services. To be funded under the priority, a project must:

(a) Investigate the availability and accessibility of community-based health services for individuals with disabilities who move from institutional care to community living or who are at risk for institutional care;

(b) Document the extent to which access to appropriate health services, including home-health, is a component of State task force recommendations regarding transitioning of individuals from institutional to community settings; and

(c) Evaluate the role of accessible community-based mental health services in the successful integration of individuals with long-term mental illness into community settings.

(2) Impact of the Prospective Payment System for Medical Rehabilitation. To be funded under the priority, a project must:

(a) Evaluate the impact of the prospective payment system for medical rehabilitation on access to medical rehabilitation services by individuals with disabilities, examining the impact on settings, services, and length of stay; and

(b) Identify the impact of multiple, health-related conditions, commonly called co-morbidities, on classification and reimbursement in the medical rehabilitation prospective payment system.

(3) Analysis of Quality Indicators for Assessing Health Services Provided to Individuals with Disabilities. To be funded under the priority, a project must:

(a) Conduct an assessment of the use of quality indicators in both the private and public sectors to determine the extent to which the needs of individuals with disabilities are reflected in these indicators;

(b) Examine the relationship of function and disability in defining the population of individuals with disabilities to whom the indicators are applied; and

(c) Determine how individuals with disabilities, payers, and providers use information from quality assessment of medical rehabilitation services.

In addition, each project must:

- Consult with the NIDRR-funded National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research (NCDDR) to develop and implement, in the first year of the grant, a plan to disseminate the DRRP's research results to: disability organizations, individuals with disabilities or their family members or both, researchers, providers, and policymakers; and

- Ensure the participation of individuals with disabilities in all phases of the research and dissemination activities.

Priority 2--Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds

This priority is intended to enhance the quality of the delivery of mental health services for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. For purposes of this priority, "individuals from diverse linguistic backgrounds" includes not only individuals who are fluent in languages other than English, but also individuals with minimal language skills who are not fluent in any language.

To be funded under this priority, a project must choose at least one, but no more than four, of the following research activities:

B-8

(1) Investigate, compare, and evaluate the effectiveness of mental health services provided by mental health providers using qualified sign language interpreters as opposed to services provided by mental health providers fluent in sign language. The research project must consider the educational, clinical, and professional credentials of each provider.

(2) Investigate, evaluate, and develop, as needed, model psychological testing instruments for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

(3) Identify, evaluate, and develop, as needed, for use in mental health settings, model communication strategies for individuals with minimal language skills who are deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind.

(4) Identify and evaluate factors that assist or hinder entrance into the delivery system of mental health services for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

(5) Identify and evaluate factors that have an impact on the effectiveness of the delivery of mental health services to deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

(6) Investigate and evaluate factors that have an impact on mental health service provision in the criminal justice system to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds, including individuals with minimal language skills.

(7) Investigate, evaluate, and develop, as needed, mental health outcome measures for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

In addition, each project must:

- Involve deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds in all phases of research, as appropriate.
- Involve family members of deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds in all phases of research, as appropriate.
- Involve individuals with disabilities and individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds in all phases of research, as appropriate.
- As directed by the NIDRR project officer for these programs, collaborate with other NIDRR projects and the National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research.

Priority 3--Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR
Research

This priority is intended to establish a project that will develop and test models for increasing the effective use of NIDRR research results. To be funded under this priority a project must--

(1) Analyze research information principally produced by NIDRR grantees to determine the extent to which any of the information has not been disseminated or has been disseminated but not effectively used.

(2) Develop models for particular kinds of information, such as engineering, health, employment, education, and independent living, and for particular intended groups such as professionals, individuals with disabilities, their family members, and researchers.

(3) Describe the models and prepare training materials in accessible and alternative formats to assist others to use the models.

(4) Test each model.

(5) Evaluate the success of each model.

In carrying out these activities, the project must:

- Provide training for NIDRR research projects and centers;
- Ensure the relevance of all activities to rehabilitation researchers, individuals with disabilities, and their family members;
- Include techniques to reach individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds; and
- Collaborate with NIDRR-funded projects and centers.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is not subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

Applicable Program Regulations: 34 CFR part 350.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512-1530.

B-12

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO access at:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.133A, Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects.)

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: 29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b).

Dated: September 12, 2002

Robert H. Pasternack,
Assistant Secretary for
Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services.

APPENDIX

Analysis of Comments and Changes

Priority 1--Health Services Research

Comment: Two commenters suggested that NIDRR add depression or other psychological conditions to the study of prospective payment in medical rehabilitation.

Discussion: Applicants could choose to propose a study pertaining to depression or other psychological conditions and the prospective payment system in medical rehabilitation; however, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on these issues. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter asked for clarification of whether the priority focuses exclusively on acute rehabilitation and not other levels and settings of care.

Discussion: Applicants could choose to propose a study that examines the range of rehabilitation settings; however, the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter asked whether the priority should focus on longer intervals of care, rather than a single inpatient rehabilitation admission.

Discussion: Applicants could choose to propose a study that focuses on longer intervals of care; however, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on this issue. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter asked whether NIDRR would allow applicants to propose related projects within a single proposal. This commenter was concerned because relevant Medicare data for examining the impact of Prospective Payment System (PPS) will not be available until later in the time period for the proposed grant award(s).

Discussion: Applicants could choose to propose related projects during the course of the study; the peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter asked whether priority (2)(b) duplicates work that the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) plans to perform to recalculate medical rehabilitation prospective payment adjustments and asked if there were specific issues about this process of concern to NIDRR, such as "omitted comorbidity codes in the IRF-PAI, inconsistent coding of

comorbidities, or comorbidities that develop or become apparent after an inpatient rehabilitation hospitalization.”

Discussion: NIDRR is not specifying that applicants duplicate work being undertaken by CMS. It is anticipated that NIDRR’s research will build on and support research being done at CMS by focusing on issues specifically affecting provision of and access to medical rehabilitation services for persons with disabilities. To the extent that the topic examples provided in the comment meet this expectation, applicants could choose to propose research on one of these areas. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Priority 2--Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds

Comment: Several commenters suggested that the priority include mental health service delivery to deaf, hard of hearing, and deaf-blind individuals in the criminal justice system, including both prisons and courtrooms. Competency determinations, particularly for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind persons with limited language abilities, therapies and psycho-educational programs within the prison system, communications

accessibility and general mental health service delivery were described as areas in need of research.

Discussion: A review of the literature reveals a paucity of published information regarding mental health service delivery to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals in the criminal justice system. This indeed suggests a need for further study and research.

Changes: The final priority invites applicants to investigate and evaluate factors that have an impact on mental health service provision in the criminal justice system to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds.

Comment: Several commenters suggested that the priority include a focus on mental health service delivery to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind children.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that a focus on children would be worthwhile, and applicants may submit applications in this area. However, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on these issues. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that funding eligibility be prioritized to State Departments of Mental Health Research Divisions, with academic institution support and consultation.

Discussion: U.S. Department of Education regulations implementing the Rehabilitation Act (34 CFR 350.3) stipulate who is eligible for an award. States and institutions of higher education are included on that list, as are public or private agencies, including for-profit agencies, public or private organizations, including for-profit organizations, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations. NIDRR will consider applications from any applicant that meets the statutory requirements under the funding authority. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of submitted proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested a focus on mental health service delivery in rural areas.

Discussion: NIDRR is concerned about mental health service delivery in rural areas. Applicants may propose to study service delivery in rural areas under questions (4) or (5); however, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on these issues. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that the priority require that deaf, hard of hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers from diverse backgrounds be included in all stages of research.

Discussion: NIDRR is a strong proponent of participatory action research and encourages consumer involvement in all stages of NIDRR-sponsored research. The proposed priority requires the involvement of individuals with disabilities, including deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals and individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. This designation includes mental health consumers and deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers.

Changes: The final priority specifies that deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind mental health consumers should be included in all phases of research.

Comment: One commenter suggested that NIDRR require that family members be included in all stages of research.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that the addition of family members would be helpful to the research process.

Changes: The priority has been changed to include a requirement that family members be included in all stages of research.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the research priority focus on mental health generally, rather than focusing

specifically on mental health and deafness.

Discussion: NIDRR funds (and has funded) a variety of mental health-related initiatives, of which this is one. The background statement supporting this priority is available from the person listed in FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT or in the application package. It demonstrates a compelling need for research in this particular area. Therefore, NIDRR has decided upon this area of focus.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter noted the growing importance of interactive video technology in psychological test instruments.

Discussion: Applicants may propose research related to interactive video technology under question (2), which deals with model psychological test instruments, or under question (5), which covers factors that have an impact on the effectiveness of service delivery. However, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on this issue. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that question (2) be split into two separate research questions so that psychological test

instruments and mental health outcome measures are listed as two separate research areas.

Discussion: NIDRR recognizes that different areas of expertise may be needed for research on psychological test instruments and mental health outcome measures.

Changes: The priority has been changed to include two separate research activities, one on psychological test instruments and a separate activity on mental health outcome measures.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the order of the listed research questions be changed to: (4), (5), (1), (2), (3), to demonstrate that the questions are interconnected and do not stand apart from each other.

Discussion: The scope of this grant is small, encouraging depth of focus. Applicants are instructed to select between one and four research questions. Applicants may, but are not required to, conceptualize the research questions as an interconnected whole.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the priority be specific as to which population (deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind) is being addressed, since each population has separate needs.

Discussion: Within the scope of the priority, applicants may choose to focus on any population or grouping of populations. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: A number of commenters raised the issue of the use of technology in mental health service delivery for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals.

Discussion: Technology is an area ripe for research, and NIDRR encourages those who are interested to submit proposals in this area. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that the issue of direct communication with a therapist who can sign, as opposed to communication with therapists via interpreters is not relevant given recent technological developments such as cochlear implants and voice-to-text computers.

Discussion: Recent technological developments certainly are relevant to communication in mental health settings. However, they do not render the question of therapists who sign vs. those who use interpreters irrelevant. Many deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals do not use voice-to-text computers or

do not have cochlear implants. If applicants wish to propose research on technology in mental health settings, they are encouraged to do so. However, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on these issues. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that the priority include a focus on deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals who communicate orally as well as those who communicate through sign language. One suggested a focus on the use of technology with oral deaf persons.

Discussion: Applicants may propose projects that focus on oral, manual, or any other type of communication, including technological. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the term "late-deafened" be added to the priority, noting that for individuals who are late-deafened, deafness may be seen as a loss rather than as a culture (as it is for many pre-lingually deaf people). This commenter also noted that late-deafened individuals may have different social, emotional and vocational experiences than pre-

lingually deaf individuals.

Discussion: Individuals who are late-deafened are subsumed under the category "deaf" and thus are included in the priority. NIDRR recognizes that the social, emotional, vocational and communicative experiences of late-deafened individuals may differ from those of culturally deaf individuals. Applicants may choose to focus research on the specific needs of late-deafened individuals. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter noted that research is needed on the use of interpreters with deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals who have minimal language skills (MLS). This commenter noted, for example, that specialized training is needed for MLS interpreters, and that the use and role of deaf interpreters for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind people with MLS should be studied.

Discussion: These indeed are important issues, and they can be proposed under question (3) of the priority. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested research into the "one-stop shop" concept for purposes of mental health service delivery to

deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals.

Discussion: Applicants may propose research into the "one-stop shop" concept under questions (4) or (5) of this priority.

However, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on this issue. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that funds should be directed to obtaining basic prevalence, demand, and incidence data to define the scope of a particular study within a particular geographic area.

Discussion: An exploration of prevalence, demand, and incidence data within a particular geographic area could be included within an application for funding. However, NIDRR has no basis to determine that all applicants should be required to focus on this issue. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested the development of standards for clinician sign language competency, and noted that many clinicians who think they can communicate in sign language in fact are not competent.

Discussion: Clinician sign language competency could be a

measure of treatment effectiveness for clinicians who sign for themselves, and could be studied under question (1). The development of actual standards of competence would need to be done in conjunction with appropriate sign language agencies and professionals in the deaf community. An applicant could propose such a project as part of question (1). The peer review process would evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the priority focus on systems of care rather than clinical issues.

Discussion: Applicants who wish to focus on systems of care issues may do so under questions (4), (5), or (6). The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested a focus on a comprehensive mental health delivery system for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind persons. The commenter noted that the system should include a broad focus of therapeutic options such as: housing, substance abuse rehabilitation, case management, mental health therapists fluent in American Sign Language, and sign language interpreters (for when signing therapists are unavailable).

Discussion: Applicants who wish to focus on systems of care issues may do so under questions (4), (5), or (6). The peer

review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that psychological testing for hard-of-hearing and late-deafened individuals currently is not a problem and does not need attention in the priority.

Discussion: All applicants, including those focusing on psychological test instruments, will need to define and justify their target population(s). The literature review will be an important part of that justification. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of submitted proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the priority focus on deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind populations generally, and include diversity within that focus (rather than focusing exclusively on diversity).

Discussion: The focus of this priority is on persons from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. However, individual applicants may devise their own organizational framework, including target population. The peer review process will evaluate the merits of submitted proposals.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested educating clinicians on communication with deaf-blind individuals.

Discussion: An applicant could pursue this issue under question (3), covering model communication strategies with deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind individuals who have minimal language skills, or under questions (4) or (5). The peer review process will evaluate the merits of the proposals.

Changes: None.

Priority 3--Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR

Research

Comment: One commenter suggested that the priority be broadened to include research projects that were not sponsored by NIDRR.

Discussion: NIDRR understands the value of research sponsored by other entities, and it may be necessary to look at this research to fully develop topic areas; however, an emphasis on NIDRR-sponsored research is preferred.

Changes: The priority has been changed to reflect that NIDRR-sponsored research is preferred.

Comment: One commenter felt that nondisability-focused research should be included, such as that pertaining to welfare-to-work projects, in order to infuse disability research with what has been learned in that area and to promote the transfer of disability research to the non-disability field.

Discussion: This comment is broader than the proposed priority area to develop specific models that could be useful for the

utilization of disability research. Just developing a model that includes other types of research will not achieve the kind of outcome this commenter seeks. This might lend itself to a broader priority in the future.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that bullet number 3 be changed to add the words "alternate media" to ensure that training materials produced would be ready for use with audiences with disabilities.

Discussion: NIDRR agrees that NIDRR supported programs should develop products that are accessible to all individuals, including alternative formats.

Changes: The priority has been changed to add the word alternative.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the second unnumbered bullet be amended to include the words "rehabilitation researchers and" individuals with disabilities.

Discussion: NIDRR wants to ensure that this priority is relevant to rehabilitation researchers and to individuals with disabilities. In the original priority, we required participation of individuals with disabilities.

Changes: The priority has been changed to reflect rehabilitation researchers, as well as family members.

SECTION C

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(CFDA No.: 84.133A)

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation

Research-Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP)
Program.

Notice inviting applications for fiscal year (FY) 2003.

PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM: The purpose of the DRRP Program is to improve the effectiveness of services authorized under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (the Act), as amended.

For FY 2003, the competition for new awards focuses on projects designed to meet the priorities we describe in the PRIORITIES section of this application notice. We intend these priorities to improve the rehabilitation services and outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Parties eligible to apply for grants under this program are States; public or private agencies, including for-profit agencies; public or private organizations, including for-profit organizations; institutions of higher education; and Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

C-1

Application Notice for Fiscal Year 2003

Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects, CFDA No. 84-133A

Funding Priority	Application Available	Deadline for Transmittal of Applications	Estimated Available Funds	Maximum award amount (per year) *	Estimated Number of Awards	Project period (months)
<u>84.133A-8</u> Health Services Research	September 12, 2002.	November 12, 2002.	\$600,000	\$300,000	2	60
<u>84.133A-11</u> Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds	September 12, 2002.	November 12, 2002.	\$600,000	\$300,000	2	60
<u>84.133A-14</u> Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research	September 12, 2002.	November 12, 2002.	\$350,000	\$350,000	1	60

Note 1: We will reject without consideration any application that proposes a budget exceeding the stated maximum award amount in any year (See 34 CFR 75.104(b)).

Note 2: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86 and 97, and (b) The program regulations 34 CFR part 350.

PRIORITIES

This competition focuses on projects designed to meet the priorities in the notice of final priorities for these programs, published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

For FY 2003, these priorities are absolute priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c) (3), we consider only applications that meet one or more of these priorities.

SELECTION CRITERIA: The selection criteria to be used for these competitions will be provided in the application package for each competition.

FOR APPLICATIONS CONTACT: Education Publications Center (ED Pubs), P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398. Telephone (toll free): 1-877-433-7827. FAX: (301) 470-1244. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call (toll free): 1-877-576-7734.

You may also contact ED Pubs via its Web site:

<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html>

Or its E-mail address

edpubs@inet.ed.gov

C-3

If you request an application from ED Pubs, be sure to identify this competition as follows: CFDA number 84.133A.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain a copy of the application package in an alternative format by contacting the Grants and Contracts Services Team, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3317, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-2550. Telephone: (202) 205-8207. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Services (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

However, the Department is not able to reproduce in an alternative format the standard forms included in the application package.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Nangle, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3412, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-2645. Telephone: (202) 205-5880 or via Internet:

Donna.Nangle@ed.gov

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), may call the TDD number at (202) 205-4475.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

C-4

Intergovernmental Review

This program is not subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: 29 U.S.C. 762(g) and 764(b).

Dated: September 12, 2002

Robert H. Pasternack,
Assistant Secretary for
Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services.

SECTION D

SELECTION CRITERIA: Health Services Research (84.133A-8)

We use the following selection criteria to evaluate applications under this program. The maximum score for all of these criteria is 100 points. The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parentheses. An additional 10 points may be earned by an applicant depending on how well they meet the additional selection criterion elsewhere in this notice.

Priority 1 - Health Services Research

(a) Responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority (10 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the responsiveness of the application to an absolute or competitive priority published in the Federal Register.

(2) In determining the application's responsiveness to the absolute or competitive priority, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant addresses all requirements of the absolute or competitive priority. (3 points)

(ii) The extent to which the applicant's proposed activities are likely to achieve the purposes of the absolute or competitive priority. (7 points)

(b) Design of research activities (37 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of research activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the research activities constitute a coherent, sustained approach to research in the field, including a substantial addition of the state-of-the art. (10 points)

(ii) The extent to which the methodology of each proposed research activity is meritorious, including consideration of the extent to which--

(A) The proposed design includes a comprehensive and informed review of the current literature, demonstrating knowledge of the state-of-the art (7 points);

(B) Each research hypothesis is theoretically sound and based on current knowledge (5 points);

(C) Each sample population is appropriate and of sufficient size (5 points);

(D) The data collection and measurement techniques are appropriate and likely to be effective; and the data analysis methods are appropriate (5 points); and

(E) The data analysis methods are appropriate (5 points).

(c) Design of dissemination activities (8 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of dissemination activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the materials to be disseminated are likely to be effective and usable, including consideration of their quality, clarity, variety, and format (4 points).

(ii) The extent to which the materials and information to be disseminated and the methods for dissemination are appropriate to the target population (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the information to be disseminated will be accessible to individuals with disabilities (2 points).

(d) Plan of operation (10 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of operation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of operation, the Secretary considers the following factor, the adequacy of the plan of operation to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and timeline for accomplishing project tasks (10 points).

(e) Collaboration (5 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of collaboration.

(2) In determining the quality of collaboration, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration with one or more agencies, organizations, or institutions is likely to be effective in achieving the relevant proposed activities of the project (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with the applicant (2 points).

(f) Adequacy and reasonableness of the budget (5 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and the reasonableness of the budget.

(2) In determining the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project activities (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant is of sufficient size, scope, and quality to effectively carry out the activities in an efficient manner (2 points).

(g) Plan of Evaluation (10 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of evaluation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of evaluation, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors.

(i) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of a project's progress that is based on identified performance measures that--

(A) Are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and expected impacts on the target population (5 points); and

(B) Are objective, and quantifiable or qualitative, as appropriate (5 points).

(h) Project Staff (10 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the project staff.

(2) In determining the quality of the project staff, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages

applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (2 points).

(3) In addition, the Secretary considers one or more of the following:

(i) The extent to which the key personnel and other key staff have appropriate training and experience in disciplines required to conduct all proposed activities (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the commitment of staff time is adequate to accomplish all the proposed activities of the project (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the key personnel are knowledgeable about the methodology and literature of pertinent subject areas (4 points).

(i) Adequacy and accessibility of resources (5 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and accessibility of the applicant's resources to implement the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy and accessibility of resources, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

D-6

(i) The extent to which the applicant is committed to provide adequate facilities, equipment, other resources, including administrative support, and laboratories, if appropriate (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the facilities, equipment, and other resources are appropriately accessible to individuals with disabilities who may use the facilities, equipment, and other resources of the project (2 points).

SECTION E

SELECTION CRITERIA for Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds (84.133A-11)

We use the following selection criteria to evaluate applications under this program.

The maximum score for all of these criteria is 100 points.

The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parentheses. An additional 10 points may be earned by an applicant depending on how well they meet the additional selection criterion elsewhere in this notice.

Priority 2 - Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds

(a) Importance of the problem (8 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the importance of the problem.

(2) In determining the importance of the problem, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which an applicant clearly describes the need and target population (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed activities address a significant need of one or more disabled populations (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project will have beneficial impact on the target population (4 points).

(b) Responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority (10 points total).

(1) The secretary considers the responsiveness of the application to an absolute or competitive priority published in the Federal Register.

(2) In determining the application's responsiveness to the absolute or competitive priority, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant addresses all requirements of the absolute or competitive priority (4 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant's proposed activities are likely to achieve the purposes of the absolute or competitive priority (6 points).

(c) Design of research activities (40 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of research activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the research activities constitute a coherent, sustained approach to research in the field, including a substantial addition to the state-of-the art (10 points).

(ii) The extent to which the methodology of each proposed research activity is meritorious, including consideration of the extent to which--

(A) The proposed design includes a comprehensive and informed review of the current literature, demonstrating knowledge of the state-of-the art (6 points);

(B) Each research hypothesis is theoretically sound and based on current knowledge (6 points);

(C) Each sample population is appropriate and of sufficient size (6 points);

(D) The data collection and measurement techniques are appropriate and likely to be effective; and the data analysis methods are appropriate (6 points); and

(E) The data analysis methods are appropriate (6 points).

(d) Plan of operation (10 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of operation.

E-3

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of operation, the Secretary considers the following factor, the adequacy of the plan of operation to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and timeline for accomplishing project tasks. (10 points)

(e) Adequacy and reasonableness of the budget (4 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and the reasonableness of the budget.

(2) In determining the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project activities (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant is of sufficient size, scope, and quality to effectively carry out the activities in an efficient manner (2 points).

(f) Plan of Evaluation (8 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of evaluation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of evaluation, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of a project's progress that is based on identified performance measures that--

(A) Are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and expected impacts on the target population (4 points); and

(B) Are objective, and quantifiable or qualitative, as appropriate (4 points).

(g) Project Staff (14 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the project staff.

(2) In determining the quality of the project staff, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (3 points).

(3) In addition, the Secretary considers one or more of the following:

(i) The extent to which the key personnel and other key staff have appropriate training and experience in disciplines required to conduct all proposed activities (4 points).

(ii) The extent to which the commitment of staff time is adequate to accomplish all the proposed activities of the project (3 points).

E-5

(iii) The extent to which the key personnel are knowledgeable about the methodology and literature of pertinent subject areas (4 points).

(h) Adequacy and accessibility of resources (6 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and accessibility of the applicant's resources to implement the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy and accessibility of resources, the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant is committed to provide adequate facilities, equipment, other resources, including administrative support, and laboratories, if appropriate (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the facilities, equipment, and other resources are appropriately accessible to individuals with disabilities who may use the facilities, equipment, and other resources of the project (3 points).

SECTION F

SELECTION CRITERIA: Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR

Research (84.133A-14)

We use the following selection criteria to evaluate applications under this program. The maximum score for all of these criteria is 100 points. The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parentheses. An additional 10 points may be earned by an applicant depending on how well they meet the additional selection criterion elsewhere in this notice.

Priority 3 - Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research

(a) Importance of the problem (9 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the importance of the problem.

(2) In determining the importance of the problem, the

Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant clearly describes the need and target population (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed activities address a significant need of one or more disabled populations (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project will have beneficial impact on the target population (3 points).

(b) Responsiveness to an absolute or competitive priority (4 points total).

F-1

(1) The Secretary considers the responsiveness of the application to the absolute or competitive priority published in the Federal Register.

(2) In determining the responsiveness of the application to the absolute or competitive priority, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant addresses all requirements of the absolute or competitive priority (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the applicant's proposed activities are likely to achieve the purposes of the absolute or competitive priority (2 points).

(c) Design of research activities (2 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of research activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the research activities constitute a coherent, sustained approach to research in the field, including a substantial addition to the state-of-the-art (2 points).

(d) Design of development activities (10 points).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of development activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project--

(A) The proposed development is based on sound conceptual model that demonstrates an awareness of the state of the art in technology (4 points);

(B) The proposed development is based on a sound conceptual model that demonstrates an awareness of the state-of-the-art in technology (2 points);

(C) The New device of technology will be developed and tested in an appropriate environment (2 points); and

(D) The new device or technique is likely to be cost-effective and useful (2 points).

(e) Design of demonstration activities (13 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of demonstration activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the proposed demonstration activities build on previous research, testing, or practices (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the proposed demonstration activities include the use of proper methodological tools and theoretically sound procedures to determine the effectiveness of the strategy or approach (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the proposed demonstration activities include innovative and effective strategies or approaches (4 points).

(iv) The extent to which the proposed demonstration activities are likely to contribute to current knowledge and practice and be a substantial addition to the state-of-the-art (2 points).

(v) The extent to which the proposed demonstration activities can be applied and replicated in other settings (2 points).

(f) Design of dissemination activities (13 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of dissemination activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the content of the information to be disseminated--

(A) Covers all of the relevant aspects of the subject matter (2 points); and

(B) If appropriate, is based on new knowledge derived from research activities of the project (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the materials to be disseminated are likely to be effective and usable, including consideration of their quality, clarity, variety, and format (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the methods for dissemination are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (2 points).

(iv) The extent to which the materials and information to be disseminated and the methods for dissemination are appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the familiarity of the target population with the subject matter, format of the information, and subject matter (3 points).

(v) The extent to which the information to be disseminated will be accessible to individuals with disabilities (2 points).

(g) Design of utilization activities (12 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of utilization activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the potential new users of the information or technology have a practical use for the information and are likely to adopt the practices or use the information or technology, including new devices (4 points).

(ii) The extent to which the utilization strategies are likely to be effective (4 points).

(iii) The extent to which the information or technology is likely to be of use in other settings (4 points).

(h) Design of technical assistance activities (12 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the extent to which the design of technical assistance activities is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project.

(2) In determining the extent to which the design is likely to be effective in accomplishing the objectives of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods for providing technical assistance are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (3 points).

(ii) The extent to which the information to be provided through technical assistance covers all of the relevant aspects of the subject matter (3 points).

(iii) The extent to which the technical assistance is appropriate to the target population, including consideration of the knowledge level of the target population, needs of the target population, and format for providing information (3 points).

(iv) The extent to which the technical assistance is accessible to individuals with disabilities (3 points).

(i) Plan of operation (6 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of operation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of operation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of the plan of operation to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, and timelines for accomplishing project tasks (3 points).

(ii) The adequacy of the plan of operation to provide for using resources, equipment, and personnel to achieve each objective (3 points).

(j) Collaboration (8 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of collaboration.

(2) In determining the quality of collaboration, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration with one or more agencies, organizations, or institutions is likely to be effective in achieving the relevant proposed activities of the project (4 point).

(ii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions demonstrate a commitment to collaborate with the applicant (2 point).

(iii) The extent to which agencies, organizations, or institutions that commit to collaborate with the applicant have the capacity to carry out collaborative activities (2 point).

(k) Adequacy and reasonableness of the budget (4 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget.

(2) In determining the adequacy and the reasonableness of the proposed budget, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the proposed project activities (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the budget for the project, including any subcontracts, is adequately justified to support the proposed project activities (2 points).

(1) Plan of evaluation (7 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the plan of evaluation.

(2) In determining the quality of the plan of evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of progress toward--

(A) Implementing the plan of operation (1 point); and

(B) Achieving the project's intended outcomes and expected impacts (1 point).

(ii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation will be used to improve the performance of the project through the feedback generated by its periodic assessments (1 point).

(iii) The extent to which the plan of evaluation provides for periodic assessment of a project's progress that is based on identified performance measures that--

(A) Are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and expected impacts on the target population (2 points); and

F-9

(B) Are objective, and quantifiable or qualitative, as appropriate (2 points).

(m) Project staff (9 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the project staff.

(2) In determining the quality of the project staff, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (2 points).

(3) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the key personnel and other key staff have appropriate training and experience in disciplines required to conduct all proposed activities (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the commitment of staff time is adequate to accomplish all the proposed activities of the project (2 points).

(iii) The extent to which the key personnel are knowledgeable about the methodology and literature of pertinent subject areas (2 points).

(iv) The extent to which key personnel have up-to-date knowledge from research or effective practice in the subject area covered in the priority (1 point).

(n) Adequacy and accessibility of resources (4 points total).

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy and accessibility of the applicant's resources to implement the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy and accessibility of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the applicant is committed to provide adequate facilities, equipment, other resources, including administrative support, and laboratories, if appropriate (2 points).

(ii) The extent to which the facilities, equipment, and other resources are appropriately accessible to individuals with disabilities who may use the facilities, equipment, and other resources of the project (2 points total).

SECTION G

Additional Selection Criterion (10 points).

We use the following additional criterion to evaluate applications under each priority.

Up to 10 points based on the extent to which an application includes effective strategies for employing and advancing in employment qualified individuals with disabilities in projects awarded under these absolute priorities. In determining the effectiveness of those strategies, we will consider the applicant's prior success, as described in the application, in employing and advancing in employment qualified individuals with disabilities. Thus, for purposes of this competitive preference, applicants can be awarded up to a total of 10 points in addition to those awarded under the published selection criteria for these priorities. That is, an applicant meeting this competitive preference could earn a maximum total of 110 points.

SECTION H

Additional Background Information

PRIORITY 1 - Health Services Research

Access to high quality health care, including preventive, acute, and long-term care, is critical to the quality of life and independent living of individuals with disabilities. Effective access may be affected by new developments in health services delivery, such as implementation of prospective payment for medical rehabilitation, Federal efforts to support community living, and development of quality indicators for use in health services delivery. NIDRR is concerned about the potential impact of these developments on the health care services of individuals with disabilities.

Research on the organization, delivery, and financing of health services has not traditionally focused on the needs of individuals with disabilities. In the past, NIDRR has funded research that focused on access to health services; the impact of managed care on health services received by individuals with disabilities; and the organization of medical rehabilitation services, such as the impact of the rehabilitation setting on outcomes. With this priority, NIDRR intends to examine emerging issues that have an impact on access to health services, with the hypothesis that access to such services is integral to community integration and independent living, as well as successful employment.

Access to Community-Based Health Services. In the 1999 decision in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) required individuals with mental disabilities be placed in community settings rather than in institutions when three conditions are met: a) treatment professionals find community placement appropriate; b) the disabled individual agrees to community placement; and c) the community placement meets the standards of reasonable accommodation (taking into account the resources of the State). Since that

decision, hundreds of complaints have been filed with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights (Rosenbaum S., Teitelbaum J., Steward A., An Analysis of Olmstead Complaints: Implications for Policy and Long-Term Planning, Center for Health Care Strategies, Consumer Action Series, December 2001). This analysis identified in-home health care and appropriate housing as the dominant complaints. The Bazelon Center's analysis of Medicaid mental health funding related to Olmstead defined "intensive community-based services" as not traditional hospital and outpatient treatment, as critical to successful implementation (Under Court Order—What the Community Integration Mandate Means for People with Mental Illnesses-The Supreme Court Ruling in Olmstead v. L.C. The Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, 1999).

On June 18, 2001, President Bush issued Executive Order 13217 charging the Attorney General, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Education, Labor, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to review policies, statutes, and regulations and recommend changes that would improve the availability of community-based services for qualified individuals with disabilities. In FY 2001, Congress appropriated \$70 million to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to provide grants to design and implement improved community supports for persons with disabilities. There were four grant categories, including "nursing facility transition" grants, "community-integrated personal assistance services and supports" grants, "real choice systems change" grants, and "national technical assistance exchange for community living" grants. In addition, the Health Care Structure and Financing section of the Olmstead preliminary report identifies a number of proposed HHS initiatives to support access to health services that will facilitate community living (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Delivering on the Promise-Preliminary Report of Federal Agencies' Actions to Eliminate Barriers and

Promote Community Integration, December 21, 2001). At the State level, however, implementation of Olmstead has proceeded slowly. As of March 2001, 36 states had created task forces to develop Olmstead strategies (Mathis J., "Community Integration of Individuals with Disabilities: An Update on Olmstead Implementation," Journal of Poverty Law and Policy, Nov.-Dec., 2001, pp. 395-410). In a 50-state survey, the National Conference of State Legislatures identified only four states with comprehensive plans: Mississippi; Missouri; Ohio; and Texas (Fox-Gage W., Folkemer D., Straw T. and Hansen A., "The States' Response to the Olmstead Decision: A Work in Progress," <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/health/forum/olmsreport.htm>).

Impact of Prospective Payment on Access to Medical Rehabilitation Services. In section 4421 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress mandated that the Health Care Financing Administration (now Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services) implement a Prospective Payment System (PPS) for inpatient rehabilitation. On January 1, 2002, this PPS system went into effect for approximately 1,200 inpatient rehabilitation facilities, including both freestanding hospitals and special units within acute-care hospitals. Under the new system, rehabilitation facility payment is based upon patient characteristics, using a patient assessment instrument, the Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Patient Assessment Instrument (IRF-PAI), that incorporates the Functional Independence Measure (FIM). To assure that there are incentives to admit and treat cases that may be extremely costly, the payment system includes provisions for payment weighted to reflect co-morbidities, payment to reflect atypical cases (short stay transfers, short stay cases, expired cases, interrupted stays), facility case-weighted adjustment (wage adjustment, low-income patient adjustment, and rural adjustment), and outliers (cases whose length of stay or costs substantially exceed the average) (Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), Overview Of The Proposed Prospective Payment System For Inpatient

Rehabilitation Hospitals And Rehabilitation Units, <http://www.hcfa.gov/medicare/irfover.htm>).

There is evidence to support concern about how changes in payment systems affect service delivery patterns. For instance, an analysis of discharges to nursing homes before and after implementation of base-year calculation under the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA) found that there was a significant increase in percentage of patients discharged to skilled nursing facilities after the base year (Chan L., Ciol M., Medicare's Payment System: Its Effect on Discharges to Skilled Nursing Facilities From Rehabilitation Hospitals, Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Vol. 81, June, 2000, pp. 715-719). The authors concluded that, "these findings have significant implications regarding the structure of Medicare's prospective payment system . . .for this class of hospital."

With the implementation of a new payment system there are questions about potential impact on length of stay, on services provided, and on discharge destination. In addition, some providers are concerned about the impact of the new payment system for diagnoses such as traumatic spinal cord and brain injury, as well as stroke, because co-morbidities such as depression, a frequent secondary condition in these medical rehabilitation diagnoses, are not currently included in the new classification system.

Impact of Quality Indicators on Delivery of Health Services to Persons with Disabilities.

Another development in service delivery is the development of quality indicators for assessing appropriateness of service delivery mechanisms, patient satisfaction, and impact of payment systems. For instance, the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality (AHRQ) is funding the Consumer Assessment of Health Plans (CAHPs) project. The CAHPs project has developed a set of surveys and reporting tools for use in assessing the experience of children and adults in health plans. This

instrument has been reviewed for its sensitivity to the concerns of persons with mobility impairments (O'Day B., Palsbo S.E., Dhont K., and Scheer J., Health Plan Selection Criteria by People with Impaired Mobility, Medical Care, accepted for publication, 2002). This assessment identified several areas of concern not covered by the current instrument, including information on: access to building or interior office space; access to physicians trained in management of specific disabilities; and problems with how to “navigate the exceptions to the pharmaceutical and durable medical equipment formularies.” In addition, persons with mobility impairments reported needing more information about “benefit coverage, physical access to preventive primary care, and the coordination of care between the primary care physician and specialists.”

One issue in the use of quality indicator tools is that of identification of disability-specific target populations in a sample of individuals using health services or health plans (e.g., case finding). Current case finding methodologies depend on the use of administrative data sets that have diagnostic and procedures codes, but typically do not include information on function. Lack of functional data may make it difficult to identify individuals with disabilities within existing data sets (DeJong G., Palsbo S., Beatty P., Jones G., Kroll T., Neri M., Bauer D., The Organization and Financing of Health Services for America's Overlooked Health Minority: Individuals with Disabilities, a paper presented at an Agency for Health Care Research and Quality meeting on the “Status of Health Services Research Associated with Disability,” April 9-10, 2001).

Additional Background Material, continued

PRIORITY - Mental Health Service Delivery to Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, and Deaf-Blind Individuals from Diverse Racial, Ethnic, and Linguistic Backgrounds

The United States (U.S.) Surgeon General recommended the following, “Seek help if you have a mental health problem or think you have symptoms of a mental disorder” (Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, 1999). In the field of mental health, “help” is based largely on the relationship between service provider and service recipient -- and this relationship is based primarily on communication. Even psychotropic medications are given in conjunction with counseling, therapy, case-management, and other communication-based services.

For individuals who are deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind, spoken English often is an ineffective means of communication. American Sign Language, tactile signing, cued speech, interpreters, and assistive listening devices are some of the methods used to augment communication. The question is how the use of these (and other) communication modalities affects outcomes in mental health service delivery for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals.

The Surgeon General also noted that individuals from racial, cultural, and linguistic minorities in the U.S. face serious barriers to competent mental health care, suffer a greater loss to overall health and productivity, and bear a greater burden from unmet mental health needs. The groups examined in the above-referenced supplement follow Federal classifications of racial and ethnic groups in the U.S.: African Americans, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and Hispanic Americans. The Surgeon General reports that, in the year 2025, about 40 percent of adults and 48 percent of children will be from racial and ethnic minority

groups (Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity, a Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, 2001).

The Surgeon General recommended that future studies identify effective interventions with minority subpopulations, including persons with co-occurring mental and physical health conditions (Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity, a Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, 2001). Deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds are important examples of this type of subpopulation. For them, the burdens of unmet mental health needs are heightened because of communication barriers. The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) estimates that approximately 8.6 percent of the national population experiences hearing loss. This includes 4.2 percent of both the Black and Hispanic populations (Ries P.W., Prevalence and characteristics of persons with hearing trouble: United States, 1990-91, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital and Health Statistics, Series 10(188), 1994).

Furthermore, each subpopulation has rich diversity and variety. Asian/Pacific Americans, for example, come from a multitude of countries and speak a variety of languages (Cheng, Li-Rong Lilly, Deafness: An Asian/Pacific Perspective, in Kathee Christensen (Ed.), Deaf Plus: A Multicultural Perspective, San Diego, CA: Dawn Sign Press; pp. 59-93, 2000). Deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals also are diverse in areas such as communication styles and preferences, and language acquisition and mastery.

For example, some deaf individuals may have picked up individual words or signs, but developed no language base. Deaf individuals with limited or no language base have been known by a variety of terms such as “low verbal,” “low functioning,” “individuals with minimal language skills,”

and (more recently) “traditionally underserved deaf persons.” Traditionally underserved deaf persons may experience additional difficulties such as cognitive impairment, illiteracy, lack of education, low income, and a lack of independence (Duffy, K., Clinical Case Management with Traditionally Underserved Deaf Adults, in Irene Leigh, Psychotherapy with Deaf Clients from Diverse Groups: Washington, DC, Gallaudet University Press, pp. 329-349, 1999). In order to avoid confusion with the use of the term “traditionally underserved” set forth in Section 21 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the term “individual with minimal language skills” hereafter is used in this priority instead of the term “traditionally underserved deaf person.”

Excellence in mental health service delivery to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals requires effective communication and culturally and linguistically appropriate test measurements and treatment modalities. This is particularly true for deaf, hard of hearing, and deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. Cultural influences can be seen, for example, in the American Indian deaf community, which reportedly uses mental health services rarely -- in part, because the process of sharing personal information is culturally unfamiliar (Eldridge N.M., Culturally Responsive Psychotherapy with American Indians Who Are Deaf, in Irene Leigh (Ed.), Psychotherapy with Deaf Clients from Diverse Backgrounds, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press; pg. 182, 1999).

Even assuming that deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals seek and receive treatment from providers familiar with their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, psychological test measures often are inadequate (Vernon M., An Historical Perspective on Psychology and Deafness, Journal of the American Deafness and Rehabilitation Association, Vol. 29(2), pg. 11, 1995). Few psychological tests and assessment instruments have been developed specifically for the deaf

population -- and none have been developed for the Asian-American deaf population (Wu C.L. and Grant N.C., Asian American and Deaf, in Irene Leigh (Ed.), Psychotherapy with Deaf Clients from Diverse Backgrounds, Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press; pg. 212, 1999).

Prior work has addressed areas such as the use of interpreters in psychotherapy, service delivery to hard-of-hearing persons, and an emerging paradigm shift that views deaf people as culturally different rather than as clinically pathological. However, none of these studies specifically address individuals who are deaf, hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blind and who may be from diverse racial, ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds (Harvey M., Psychotherapy with Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Persons: A Systemic Model, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1989; Glickman N.S. and Harvey M., Eds, Culturally Affirmative Psychotherapy with Deaf Persons, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1996; Trychin S., Mental Health Practitioner's Guide: Providing Mental Health Services to People who are Hard-of-Hearing, International Federation of Hard-of-Hearing People, <http://www.ifhoh.org/trychin2.htm>).

An additional concern raised in the field is the adequacy and acceptability of using sign language interpreters in psychotherapy sessions with clinicians who do not know sign language. One unresolved question is whether whether psychotherapy sessions conducted via third parties (i.e., interpreters) provide an equal level of mental health care for deaf people as psychotherapy sessions provided directly by clinicians who are fluent in sign language (Lytle, Linda Risser, and Lewis, Jeffrey W., Deaf Therapists, Deaf Clients, and the Therapeutic Relationship, in Glickman N.S. and Harvey M., Eds, Culturally Affirmative Psychotherapy with Deaf Persons, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., p. 264, 1996). Also at issue is whether services provided through interpreters offer a truly effective means of communication in the mental health treatment context (Lee, Randy and

Kearney, Mary Kate, Setting the Legal Context: What is the Meaning of Equal Access to Mental Health Services? In Myers, R., (ed.), Standards of Care for the Delivery of Mental Health Services to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons, R.R. Myers Consulting, Mental Health/Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Services, 1995, distributed by the National Association of the Deaf, 814 Thayer Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910-4500).

The Standards of Care cited above also address a range of other issues related to mental health care for deaf and hard of hearing persons. These include, for example, psychological testing, racial and ethnic diversity, deaf-blind individuals; and deaf persons with minimal language skills. These standards generally consist of basic explanations, “how to” instructions, and recommendations for service providers. As noted by many of the authors, a broader knowledge base is needed in these and other areas in order to improve service to these populations (Myers, R., (ed.), Standards of Care for the Delivery of Mental Health Services to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Persons, R.R. Myers Consulting, Mental Health/Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Services, 1995, distributed by the National Association of the Deaf, 814 Thayer Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910-4500).

For purposes of this priority, the term “qualified interpreter” is defined in accordance with the definition used in the Americans with Disabilities Act: “A qualified interpreter means an interpreter who is able to interpret effectively, accurately, and impartially both receptively and expressively, using any necessary specialized vocabulary” (28 CFR 36.104).

This proposed priority focuses on the mental health service delivery system. However, the Department is considering adding an invitational priority in the final priority that will include mental health service delivery in the criminal justice system to deaf, hard-of-hearing, and deaf-blind individuals from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. H-10

Additional Background Material, Continued

Priority - Developing Models To Promote the Use of NIDRR Research

NIDRR proposes a priority to develop models to ensure that NIDRR-sponsored research findings and products relate to practical applications in planning, policymaking, program administration, and the delivery of services to people with disabilities. The use of research findings and products has been a NIDRR goal. Grantees must address their plans for the dissemination and utilization (D&U) of research information in grant applications. They are encouraged to systematically distribute information using a variety of methods. NIDRR has provided technical assistance to help grantees include plans for D&U at the beginning of their grants. Monitoring of these activities has taken place in the regular monitoring process.

In its publication, “Developing an Effective Dissemination Plan,” the National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research (NCDDR) sets out steps that could be used to develop an effective dissemination plan (NCDDR, Austin, TX, August 2000, available at: www.ncddr.org). While these steps focus on shaping activities designed to address the needs and concerns of the group expected to embrace the research, it does not go into as much depth on how to achieve the use of the information or how to know that it has been used to change policies or affect practice.

NIDRR has made efforts to obtain from grantees information about significant accomplishments that have resulted from the research conducted at their projects or centers. In addition, the NCDDR has published “success stories” each year.

The NCDDR has provided direct technical assistance, as well as publications, to help foster the dissemination efforts of grantees. However, not as much emphasis has been given to the preparation of

models for the utilization of NIDRR research information. Also, replicable models specific to NIDRR have not been produced, documented, or disseminated.

This priority invites an examination of the ways in which NIDRR-supported research can successfully be put to use. It asks for the preparation of models based on NIDRR research topics outlined in the New Freedom Initiative or the NIDRR Long Range Plan (www.ncddr.org/new/announcements.htm). The priority also calls for the documentation of models that have successfully been used .

NIDRR emphasizes the participation of people with disabilities and family members in the formulation and conduct of research studies. It also stresses that the end point of NIDRR research is its use to achieve the full participation of individuals with disabilities in all aspects of education, employment, and community life.

Moving research to practice has been addressed in such previous NIDRR activities as: planning for dissemination and utilization; “translating” research results to make them more easily understood by the consumer; making results available and accessible using technology such as databases, research libraries, and websites; developing distance learning courses; and publishing and presenting the results of research in academic settings. In addition, NIDRR has supported efforts to perform market research to determine the kinds of information people need and the formats they would like best to receive that information. Also, NIDRR has taken steps to inform individuals with disabilities that research can be useful to them. A NIDRR grantee has assisted researchers to help them transform their specialized research terminology into more general language.

SECTION I

Research activities involving human subjects supported by awards under these programs are subject to Department of Education Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Applicants answering "Yes" to item 12 on form ED 424 whose research activities are nonexempt must complete the seven point narrative on protection of human subjects described in the Attachment to form ED 424. Additional seven point narratives are required if research is being conducted at other sites.

Copies of the Department of Education regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects are available from the Grants Policy and Oversight Staff (GPOS), Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Washington, D.C., telephone: (202) 708-8263 and on the Protection of Human Subjects in research Web Site at <http://ocfo.ed.gov/humansub.htm>

SECTION J

FREQUENT QUESTIONS

1. CAN I GET AN EXTENSION OF THE DUE DATE?

No. On rare occasions the Department of Education may extend a closing date for all applicants. If that occurs, a notice of the revised due date is published in the Federal Register. However, there are no extensions or exceptions to the due date made for individual applicants.

2. WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE APPLICATION?

The application should include a project narrative, vitae of key personnel, and a budget, as well as the Assurances forms included in this package. Vitae of staff or consultants should include the individual's title and role in the proposed project, and other information that is specifically pertinent to this proposed project. The budgets for both the first year and all subsequent project years should be included. If collaboration with another organization is involved in the proposed activity, the application should include assurances of participation by the other parties, including written agreements or assurances of cooperation. It is not useful to include general letters of support or endorsement in the application. If the applicant proposes to use unique tests or other measurement instruments that are not widely known in the field, it would be helpful to include the instrument in the application. Many applications contain voluminous appendices that are not helpful and in many cases cannot even be mailed to the reviewers. It is generally not helpful to include such things as brochures, general capability statements of collaborating organizations, maps, copies of publications, or descriptions of other projects completed by the applicant.

3. WHAT FORMAT SHOULD BE USED FOR THE APPLICATION?

NIDRR generally advises applicants that they may organize the application to follow the selection criteria that will be used. The specific review criteria vary according to the specific program, and are contained in this Consolidated Application Package.

4. MAY I SUBMIT APPLICATIONS TO MORE THAN ONE NIDRR PROGRAM COMPETITION OR MORE THAN ONE APPLICATION TO A PROGRAM?

Yes, you may submit applications to any program for which they are responsive to the program requirements. You may submit the same application to as many competitions as you believe appropriate. You may also submit more than one application in any given competition.

5. WHAT IS THE ALLOWABLE INDIRECT COST RATE?

The limits on indirect costs vary according to the program and the type of application. The DRRP program should limit indirect charges to the organization's approved rate.

6. CAN PROFITMAKING BUSINESSES APPLY FOR GRANTS?

Yes, for the Field Initiated. However, for-profit organizations will not be able to collect a fee or profit on the grant, and in some programs will be required to share in the costs of the project.

7. CAN INDIVIDUALS APPLY FOR GRANTS?

No. Only organizations are eligible to apply for grants under NIDRR programs. However, individuals are the only entities eligible to apply for fellowships (84.133F).

8. CAN NIDRR STAFF ADVISE ME WHETHER MY PROJECT IS OF INTEREST TO NIDRR OR LIKELY TO BE FUNDED?

No. NIDRR staff can advise you of the requirements of the program in which you propose to submit your application. However, staff cannot advise you of whether your subject area or proposed approach is likely to receive approval.

9. HOW DO I ASSURE THAT MY APPLICATION WILL BE REFERRED TO THE MOST APPROPRIATE PANEL FOR REVIEW?

Applicants should be sure that their applications are referred to the correct competition by clearly including the competition title and CFDA number, including alphabetical code, on the Standard Form 424, and including a project title that describes the project.

10. HOW SOON AFTER SUBMITTING MY APPLICATION CAN I FIND OUT IF IT WILL BE FUNDED?

The time from closing date to grant award date varies from program to program. Generally speaking, NIDRR endeavors to have awards made within five to six months of the closing date. Unsuccessful applicants generally will be notified within that time frame as well. For the purpose of estimating a project start date, the applicant should estimate approximately six months from the closing date, but no later than the following September 30.

11. CAN I CALL NIDRR TO FIND OUT IF MY APPLICATION IS BEING FUNDED?

No. When NIDRR is able to release information on the status of grant applications, it will notify applicants by letter. The results of the peer review cannot be released except through this formal notification.

12. IF MY APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL, CAN I ASSUME I WILL GET THE REQUESTED BUDGET AMOUNT IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS?

No. Funding in subsequent years is subject to availability of funds and project performance.

13. WILL ALL APPROVED APPLICATIONS BE FUNDED?

No. It often happens that the peer review panels approve for funding more applications than NIDRR can fund within available resources. Applicants who are approved but not funded are encouraged to consider submitting similar applications in future competitions.

POINTS TO REMEMBER IN APPLICATION PREPARATION

1. In the title block of #4 on the 424 form, please note the appropriate CFDA. 84.133A-, number and the title as soon on C-2.
2. It is important to verify with your fiscal office the DUNS number which goes in Block #2 on the ED 424 form. If you do not have one, call 1-800-333-0505 to set one up.
3. Mark Block #10, the EO 12372 as no and not covered. These three programs are not covered.
4. Budget Information: **BE SURE TO CHECK THE MATH** – the application will not be reviewed if the request for funds on the ED 424 block 14a, the ED 524 form or the budget justifications goes over the maximum amount for any year. A detailed budget narrative is needed for the total grant period years requested. By requesting detailed budget information in the initial application for the total project period, the need for formal non-competing continuation applications in the remaining years will be eliminated. A performance report that will be required annually will be used in place of the continuation application to determine progress. Definitions for the most inquired budget categories:

Equipment - Tangible, non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. However, consistent with institutional policy, lower limits may be established.

Supplies - Direct materials and supplies that are consumable, expendable and of a relatively low unit cost.

Key Personnel - The personnel category of the budget includes **all** project staff members who are employees of the applicant. However, **KEY PERSONNEL** are defined as the Project Director, Principle Investigator, and Project Coordinator.

Other - Where applicants may place all direct costs that are not clearly covered by the other direct cost categories. It is a catch-all category that could include a wide variety of costs that do not seem to "fit" elsewhere in the budget.

5. Organize your narrative in accordance with the selection criterion in SECTION D, E or F of this package. Address all criteria, including the additional 10 points. Include a table of contents in your application in order to highlight where the selection criteria can be found in the application.

6. Number all pages to make it easier for the reader to refer to a page number if comments are given (including the appendices).
7. We strongly suggest keeping the narrative to 75 pages, double-spaced. The one-page abstract may be single-spaced. Not included in these pages are the forms, the abstract, the budget narrative/justification or the information on human subjects.
8. Application must be postmarked by the closing date of November 12, 2002. If sending by courier service (i.e., Fed X, UPS, Postal Express), please hand deliver between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., to the following address: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Room 3671, General Services Administration National Capital Region, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4725. The phone number in ACC to list for express mail is 202-708-9493.
9. Remember to include a seven point narrative on the protection of Human Subjects as it pertains to your grant if you check “yes” on block number 12 of the 424 form. If you check “no” please include a paragraph of why it is not required.

J-4

SECTION K

Application Transmittal Instructions for Mail or Hand Delivery

An application for an award must be postmarked or hand delivered by the closing date of **November 12, 2002**.

Applications Sent by Mail

An application sent by mail must be addressed to the U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA 84.133A- and title, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202-4725.

An application must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:

- (1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service Postmark.
- (2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.
- (3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.
- (4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary does not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

- (1) A private metered postmark, or
- (2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

An applicant should note that the U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office.

An applicant is encouraged to use registered or at least first class mail.

Each late applicant will be notified that its application will not be considered.

Application Delivered by Hand/Carrier Service

An application that is hand delivered must be taken to the U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, ATTENTION CFDA 84.133A- and title, Room 3671, Regional Office Building #3, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, DC 20202-4725.

The Application Control Center will accept deliveries between 8:00 a.m., and 4:30 p.m. (Washington, D.C.) daily, except Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays.

Individuals delivering applications must use the D Street entrance. Proper identification is necessary to enter the building.

In order for an application sent through a Courier Service to be considered timely, the Courier Service must be in receipt of the application on or before the closing date.

SECTION L

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION NARRATIVE

Recommended Page Limits:

The Secretary strongly recommends that applicants:

- (1) include a one-page abstract in their application;
- (2) limit Part III - Application Narrative to no more than 75 double-spaced 8.5 x 11" pages (on one side only) with one inch margins (top, bottom, and sides);
- (3) double-space (no more than 3 lines per vertical inch) all sections of text in the application narrative; and
- (4) use no smaller than a 12-point font, and an average character density no greater than 14 characters per inch.

The recommended application narrative page limit does not apply to: Part I – ED 424 form; Part II - the budget section ED 524, including the narrative budget justification; and Part IV - the assurances and certifications. In addition the page limitation does not apply to the one-page abstract or the six point narrative on the protection of human subjects. Applicants should note that reviewers are not required to review any information provided in the appendixes. The recommendations for double-spacing and font do not apply within charts, tables, figures, and graphs, but the information presented in those formats should be easily readable.

APPLICATION FORMS

The enclosed forms shall be used by all applicants for Federal Assistance under all NIDRR programs. A separate application must be submitted for each grant sought. No grant may be awarded unless the completed application forms have been received. If an item does not appear to be relevant to the assistance requested, write "NA" for not applicable.

This application consists of four parts. These parts are organized in the same manner that the submitted application should be organized. These parts are as follows:

Part I - Federal Assistance Application Face Page

Part II - Budget Information

Part III - Application Narrative

Part IV - Assurances, Certifications and Disclosures

Each submitted application should include an index or table of contents and a one-page project abstract. Pages should be consecutively numbered.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1820-0027. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 40 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

Under terms of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended, and the regulations implementing that Act, the Department of Education invites comment on the public reporting burden in this collection of information. You may send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1820-0027, Washington, D.C. 20503.

PART I - FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FACE PAGE (424)

Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424)

U.S. Department of Education

Form Approved
OMB No. 1875-0106
Exp. 11/30/2004

Applicant Information

1. Name and Address

Legal Name: _____

Address: _____

City _____ State _____ County _____ ZIP Code + 4 _____

2. Applicant's D-U-N-S Number |____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|____|

3. Applicant's T-I-N |____|____| - |____|____|____|____|____|____|

4. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance #: 84. |____|____|____|____|

Title: _____

5. Project Director: _____

Address: _____

City _____ State _____ Zip code + 4 _____

Tel. #: () _____ - _____ Fax #: () _____ - _____

E-Mail Address: _____

6. Novice Applicant ____ Yes ____ No

7. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? ____ Yes ____ No
(If "Yes," attach an explanation.)

8. Type of Applicant (Enter appropriate letter in the box.) |____|

A - State

B - Local

C - Special District

D - Indian Tribe

E - Individual

F - Independent School District

G - Public College or University

H - Private, Non-profit College or University

I - Non-profit Organization

J - Private, Profit-Making Organization

K - Other (Specify): _____

Application Information

9. Type of Submission:

-PreApplication

____ Construction

____ Non-Construction

-Application

____ Construction

____ Non-Construction

10. Is application subject to review by Executive Order 12372 process?

____ Yes (Date made available to the Executive Order 12372 process for review): ____/____/____

____ No (If "No," check appropriate box below.)

____ Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

____ Program has not been selected by State for review.

11. Proposed Project Dates: ____/____/____

Start Date:

End Date:

12. Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project period?

____ Yes (Go to 12a.)

____ No (Go to item 13.)

12a. Are all the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?

____ Yes (Provide Exemption(s) #): _____

____ No (Provide Assurance #): _____

13. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:

Estimated Funding

14a. Federal \$ _____ . 00

b. Applicant \$ _____ . 00

c. State \$ _____ . 00

d. Local \$ _____ . 00

e. Other \$ _____ . 00

f. Program Income \$ _____ . 00

g. TOTAL \$ _____ . 00

Authorized Representative Information

15. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this preapplication/application are true and correct. The document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant and the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if the assistance is awarded.

a. Authorized Representative (Please type or print name clearly.)

b. Title: _____

c. Tel. #: () _____ - _____ Fax #: () _____ - _____

d. E-Mail Address: _____

e. Signature of Authorized Representative

Date: ____/____/____

Instructions for Form ED 424

- 1. Legal Name and Address.** Enter the legal name of applicant and the name of the primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity.
 - 2. D-U-N-S Number.** Enter the applicant's D-U-N-S Number. If your organization does not have a D-U-N-S Number, you can obtain the number by calling 1-800-333-0505 or by completing a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. The form can be obtained via the Internet at the following URL: <http://www.dnb.com>.
 - 3. Tax Identification Number.** Enter the taxpayer's identification number as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.
 - 4. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number.** Enter the CFDA number and title of the program under which assistance is requested. The CFDA number can be found in the federal register notice and the application package.
 - 5. Project Director.** Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application.
 - 6. Novice Applicant.** Check "Yes" or "No" only if assistance is being requested under a program that gives special consideration to novice applicants. Otherwise, **leave blank.**

Check "Yes" if you meet the requirements for novice applicants specified in the regulations in 34 CFR 75.225 and included on the attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." By checking "Yes" the applicant certifies that it meets these novice applicant requirements. Check "No" if you do not meet the requirements for novice applicants.
 - 7. Federal Debt Delinquency.** Check "Yes" if the applicant's organization is delinquent on any Federal debt. (This question refers to the applicant's organization and not to the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.) Otherwise, check "No."
 - 8. Type of Applicant.** Enter the appropriate letter in the box provided.
 - 9. Type of Submission.** See "Definitions for Form ED 424" attached.
 - 10. Executive Order 12372.** See "Definitions for Form ED 424" attached. Check "Yes" if the application is subject to review by E.O. 12372. Also, please enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001). Otherwise, check "No."
 - 11. Proposed Project Dates.** Please enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001).
 - 12. Human Subjects Research.** (See I.A. "Definitions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424.")
 - If Not Human Subjects Research.** Check "No" if research activities involving human subjects are not planned at any time during the proposed project period. The remaining parts of Item 12 are then not applicable.
 - If Human Subjects Research.** Check "Yes" if research activities involving human subjects are planned at any time during the proposed project period, either at the applicant organization or at any other performance site or collaborating institution. Check "Yes" even if the research is exempt from the regulations for the protection of human subjects. (See I.B. "Exemptions" in attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424.")
 - 12a. If Human Subjects Research is Exempt from the Human Subjects Regulations.** Check "Yes" if all the research activities proposed are designated to be exempt from the regulations. Insert the exemption number(s) corresponding to one or more of the six exemption categories listed in I.B. "Exemptions." In addition, follow the instructions in II.A. "Exempt Research Narrative" in the attached page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." Insert this narrative immediately following the ED 424 face page.
 - 12a. If Human Subjects Research is Not Exempt from Human Subjects Regulations.** Check "No" if some or all of the planned research activities are covered (not exempt). In addition, follow the instructions in II.B. "Nonexempt Research Narrative" in the page entitled "Definitions for Form ED 424." Insert this narrative immediately following the ED 424 face page.
 - 12a. Human Subjects Assurance Number.** If the applicant has an approved Federal Wide (FWA) or Multiple Project Assurance (MPA) with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, that covers the specific activity, insert the number in the space provided. If the applicant does not have an approved assurance on file with OHRP, enter "None." In this case, the applicant, by signature on the face page, is declaring that it will comply with 34 CFR 97 and proceed to obtain the human subjects assurance upon request by the designated ED official. If the application is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain the assurance within 30 days after the specific formal request.
- Note about Institutional Review Board Approval.** ED does not require certification of Institutional Review Board approval with the application. However, if an application that involves non-exempt human subjects research is recommended/selected for funding, the designated ED official will request that the applicant obtain and send the certification to ED within 30 days after the formal request.
- 13. Project Title.** Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing

project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.

14. Estimated Funding. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate **only** the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 14.

15. Certification. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. Be sure to enter the telephone and fax number and e-mail address of the authorized representative. Also, in item 15e, please

enter the month, day, and four (4) digit year (e.g., 12/12/2001) in the date signed field.

Paperwork Burden Statement. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1875-0106. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average between 15 and 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: **U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651.** If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form write directly to: **Joyce I. Mays, Application Control Center, U.S. Department of Education, 7th and D Streets, S.W. ROB-3, Room 3671, Washington, D.C. 20202-4725**

Novice Applicant (See 34 CFR 75.225). For discretionary grant programs under which the Secretary gives special consideration to novice applications, a novice applicant means any applicant for a grant from ED that—

- Has never received a grant or subgrant under the program from which it seeks funding;
- Has never been a member of a group application, submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, that received a grant under the program from which it seeks funding; and
- Has not had an active discretionary grant from the Federal government in the five years before the deadline date for applications under the program. For the purposes of this requirement, a grant is active until the end of the grant's project or funding period, including any extensions of those periods that extend the grantee's authority to obligate funds.

In the case of a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, a group includes only parties that meet the requirements listed above.

Type of Submission. "Construction" includes construction of new buildings and acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees and the cost of acquisition of land). "Construction" also includes remodeling to meet standards, remodeling designed to conserve energy, renovation or remodeling to accommodate new technologies, and the purchase of existing historic buildings for conversion to public libraries. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them; and such term includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of library services.

Executive Order 12372. The purpose of Executive Order 12372 is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for the coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance and direct Federal development. The application notice, as published in the Federal Register, informs the applicant as to whether the program is subject to the requirements of E.O. 12372. In addition, the application package contains information on the State Single Point of Contact. An applicant is still eligible to apply for a grant or grants even if its respective State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a State Single Point of Contact. For additional information on E.O. 12372 go to <http://www.cfda.gov/public/eo12372.htm>.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

I. Definitions and Exemptions

A. Definitions.

A research activity involves human subjects if the activity is research, as defined in the Department's regulations, and the research activity will involve use of human subjects, as defined in the regulations.

—Research

The ED Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects, Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 97, define research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge." *If an activity follows a deliberate plan whose purpose is to develop or*

contribute to generalizable knowledge it is research. Activities which meet this definition constitute research whether or not they are

conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.

—Human Subject

The regulations define human subject as "a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) identifiable private information." *(1) If an activity involves obtaining information about a living person by manipulating that person or that person's environment, as might occur when a new instructional technique is tested, or by communicating or interacting with the individual, as occurs with surveys and interviews, the definition of human subject is met. (2) If an activity involves obtaining private information about a living person in such a way that the information can be linked to that individual (the identity of the subject is or may be readily determined by the investigator or associated with the information), the definition of human subject is met.* [Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information which has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public (for example, a school health record).]

B. Exemptions.

Research activities in which the **only** involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following six categories of **exemptions** are not covered by the regulations:

(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. *If the subjects are children, exemption 2 applies only to research involving educational tests and observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed. Exemption 2 does not apply if children are surveyed or interviewed or if the research involves observation of public behavior and the investigator(s) participate in the activities being observed.* [Children are defined as persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law or jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.]

(3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under section (2) above, if the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (a) public benefit or service programs; (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (b) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

II. Instructions for Exempt and Nonexempt Human Subjects Research Narratives

If the applicant marked “Yes” for Item 12 on the ED 424, the applicant must provide a human subjects “exempt research” or “nonexempt research” narrative and insert it immediately following the ED 424 face page.

A. Exempt Research Narrative.

If you marked “Yes” for item 12 a. and designated exemption numbers(s), provide the “exempt research” narrative. The narrative must contain sufficient information about the involvement of human subjects in the proposed research to allow a determination by ED that the designated exemption(s) are appropriate. The narrative must be succinct.

B. Nonexempt Research Narrative.

If you marked “No” for item 12 a. you must provide the “nonexempt research” narrative. The narrative must address the following seven points. Although no specific page limitation applies to this section of the application, be succinct.

(1) **Human Subjects Involvement and Characteristics:** Provide a detailed description of the proposed involvement of human subjects. Describe the characteristics of the subject population, including their anticipated number, age range, and health status. Identify the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of any subpopulation. Explain the rationale for the involvement of special classes of subjects, such as children, children with disabilities, adults with disabilities, persons with mental disabilities, pregnant women, prisoners, institutionalized individuals, or others who are likely to be vulnerable

(2) **Sources of Materials:** Identify the sources of research material obtained from individually identifiable living human subjects in the form of specimens, records, or data. Indicate whether the material or data will be obtained specifically for research purposes or whether use will be made of existing specimens, records, or data.

(3) **Recruitment and Informed Consent:** Describe plans for the recruitment of subjects and the consent procedures to be followed. Include the circumstances under which consent will be sought and obtained, who will seek it, the nature of the information to be provided to prospective subjects, and the method of documenting consent. State if the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has authorized a modification

or waiver of the elements of consent or the requirement for documentation of consent.

(4) **Potential Risks:** Describe potential risks (physical, psychological, social, legal, or other) and assess their likelihood and seriousness. Where appropriate, describe alternative treatments and procedures that might be advantageous to the subjects.

(5) **Protection Against Risk:** Describe the procedures for protecting against or minimizing potential risks, including risks to confidentiality, and assess their likely effectiveness. Where appropriate, discuss provisions for ensuring necessary medical or professional intervention in the event of adverse effects to the subjects. Also, where appropriate, describe the provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.

(6) **Importance of the Knowledge to be Gained:** Discuss the importance of the knowledge gained or to be gained as a result of the proposed research. Discuss why the risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits to subjects and in relation to the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

(7) **Collaborating Site(s):** If research involving human subjects will take place at collaborating site(s) or other performance site(s), name the sites and briefly describe their involvement or role in the research.

Copies of the Department of Education’s Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects, 34 CFR Part 97 and other pertinent materials on the protection of human subjects in research are available from the Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4248, telephone: (202) 708-8263, and on the U.S. Department of Education’s Protection of Human Subjects in Research Web Site at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OCFO/humansub.html>

PART II - BUDGET INFORMATION



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUDGET INFORMATION
NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

OMB Control No. 1890--0004

Expiration Date: 02/28/2003

Name of Institution/Organization

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

Name of Institution/Organization

Applicants requesting funding for only one year should complete the column under "Project Year 1." Applicants requesting funding for multi-year grants should complete all applicable columns. Please read all instructions before completing form.

**SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Project Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						
3. Travel						
4. Equipment						
5. Supplies						
6. Contractual						
7. Construction						
8. Other						
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)						
10. Indirect Costs						
11. Training Stipends						
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)						

SECTION C - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION (see instructions)

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. This form is now undergoing OMB clearance and should be considered draft until a new valid OMB collection number is obtained.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to vary from 13 to 22 hours per response, with an average of 17.5 hours per response, including the time reviewing instructions, searching existing data resources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, DC 20202-4651; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1875-0102, Washington, DC 20503.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ED FORM 524

General Instructions

This form is used to apply to individual U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs. Unless directed otherwise, provide the same budget information for each year of the multi-year funding request. Pay attention to applicable program instructions if attached.

Section A – Budget Summary U.S. Department of Education Funds

All applicants must complete Section A and provide a breakdown by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-11.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e):

For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f):

Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If funding is requested for only one project year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e):

Show the total budget request for each project year for which funding is requested.

Line 12, column (f):

Show the total amount requested for all project years. If funding is requested for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section B – Budget Summary Non-Federal Funds

If you are required to provide or volunteer to provide matching funds or other non-Federal resources to the project, these should be shown for each applicable budget category on lines 1-11 of Section B.

Lines 1-11, columns (a)-(e):

For each project year for which matching funds or other contributions are provided, show the total contribution for each applicable budget category.

Lines 1-11, column (f):

Show the multi-year total for each budget category. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this column blank.

Line 12, columns (a)-(e):

Show the total matching or other contribution for each project year.

Line 12, column (f):

Show the total amount to be contributed for all years of the multi-year project. If non-Federal contributions are provided for only one year, leave this space blank.

Section C – Other Budget Information

Pay attention to applicable program specific instructions, if attached.

1. Provide an itemized budget breakdown, by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B.
2. If applicable to this program, enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period. In addition, enter the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.
3. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.
4. Provide other explanations or comments you deem necessary.

PART III - ASSURANCES, CERTIFICATIONS, DISCLOSURES

ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. . . 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. . . 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. . 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. . . 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) . . 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. . . 290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. . 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
8. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. . . 1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. . . 276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. . 276c and 18 U.S.C. . . 874) and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. . . 327-333), regarding labor standards for federally assisted construction subagreements.
10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. . . 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clear Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. . . 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93-205).
12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. . . 1721 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. . 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. . . 469a-1 et seq.).
14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.
15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. . . 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.
16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. . . 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead- based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, □Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.□
18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE	
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION		DATE SUBMITTED

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying," and 34 CFR Part 85, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110--

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgement rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (2)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transaction (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610 -

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610-

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND / OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

**Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and
Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transactions**

This certification is required by the Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled ☐ Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions, ☐ without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification

- (1) The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure)

Type of Federal Action: _____ a. contract _____ b. grant _____ c. cooperative agreement _____ d. loan _____ e. loan guarantee _____ f. loan insurance	Status of Federal Action: _____ a. bid/offer/application _____ b. initial award _____ c. post-award	Report Type: _____ a. initial filing _____ b. material change For material change only: Year _____ quarter _____ Date of last report _____
Name and Address of Reporting Entity: _____ Prime _____ Subawardee Tier _____, if Known: Congressional District, if known:	If Reporting Entity in No. 4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime: Congressional District, if known:	
6. Federal Department/Agency:	7. Federal Program Name/Description: Federal Program Name/Description: CFDA Number, if applicable: _____	
8. Federal Action Number, if known:	9. Award Amount, if known: Award Amount, if known: \$ _____	
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant <i>(if individual, last name, first name, MI):</i>	b. Individuals Performing Services <i>(including address if different from No. 10a)</i> <i>(last name, first name, MI):</i>	
11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.	Signature: _____ Print Name: _____ Title: _____ Telephone No.: _____ Date: _____	
Federal Use Only	Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF SF-LLL, DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.
2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.
3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.
4. Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.
5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks "Subawardee," then enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.
6. Enter the name of the federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.
7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.
8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitations for Bid (IFB) number; grant announcement number; the contract, grant, or loan award number; the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Included prefixes, e.g., "RFP-DE-90-001."
9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.
10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, State and zip code of the lobbying registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

(b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10(a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).
11. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503

SECTION M

DUNS Number Instructions

D-U-N-S No.: Please provide the applicant's D-U-N-S Number. You can obtain your D-U-N-S Number at no charge by calling **1-800-333-0505** or by completing a D-U-N-S Number Request Form. The form can be obtained via the Internet at the following URL:

<http://www.dnb.com/dbis/aboutdb/intlduns.htm>

The D-U-N-S Number is a unique nine-digit number that does not convey any information about the recipient. A built in check digit helps assure the accuracy of the D-U-N-S Number. The ninth digit of each number is the check digit, which is mathematically related to the other digits. It lets computer systems determine if a D-U-N-S Number has been entered correctly.

Dun & Bradstreet, a global information services provider, has assigned D-U-N-S numbers to over 43 million companies worldwide.

SECTION N

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Does your application include each of the following?

- ☐ Cover page (SF 424) marked appropriately
- ☐ Budget form (ED form 524) dollar amounts not exceeding the maximum in any year
- ☐ Budget narrative for each year (MATH CHECKED)
- ☐ Program narrative, including abstract and responses to the APPROPRIATE selection criteria
- ☐ Assurances and Certifications [list]
- ☐ If submitting on e-application, did you download the correct file in the required field?

Did You --

- ☐ Provide one (1) original plus 2 copies of the application (One original and seven copies are requested)?
- ☐ Include all required forms with original signatures and dates?
- ☐ Include narrative on the Protection of Human Subjects?
- ☐ Did you click on the submit button, if submitting on e-applications?
- ☐ If submitting on e-application, did you fax your 424 form to the Application Control Center?

- | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mail* Application To: | OR | Hand deliver* Application To: |
| ATTN: 84.133A- and title | | |
| U.S. Department of Education | | |
| Application Control Center | | |
| 400 Maryland Avenue, SW | | |
| Washington, DC 20202-4725 | | |